



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

09/867,517

05/29/2001

David Boreham

P5837

7455

32615

7590

09/20/2005

OSHA LIANG L.L.P./SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

REID, CHERYL M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,517

Applicant(s)

BOREHAM ET AL.

Examiner

Cheryl M. Reid

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5 and 9 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date attached.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 have been examined.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 6-7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. In regards to Applicant's arguments that Vora does not teach determining a scope, this assertion is respectfully traversed. Vora teaches of determining a scope (fig 3a, col 9, lines 50-67, col 10, lines 1-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2-3, 4, 6, 7, 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powers et al (US 6615182) hereinafter Powers in view of Vora et al (US 6539379) hereinafter Vora.
5. In regards to claim 1, 2-3, 6-7, Powers teaches of: a directory server (Col 6, line 1, fig. 2, item 102); creating a Class of Service (CoS) scheme, wherein the CoS scheme comprises one CoS Template entry (Fig. 4, item 142); and a CoS Definition entry, wherein the CoS definition entry contains an attribute whose value points to the CoS

Art Unit: 2142

template entry (Fig 4, item 144), the CoS Definition entry contains an attribute whose value points to the CoS template entry using the distinguishing Name (DN) (DN is user id in Powers) of the CoS Template Entry (Fig 4, item 144) Powers does not explicitly teach of determining a scope of the COS definition entry by a position of the COS definition entry in the directory server nor the CoS definition contains a list of attribute types. In an analogous art, Vora teaches on this aspect (Fig 3a, col 9, lines 40-65). As best understood, Examiner is interpreting determining a scope of the COS definition entry by a position of the COS definition entry in the directory server, as determining the scope of the COS based on the position in the directory server. Vora teaches of the CoS definition entry contains a list of attribute types (fig 1b). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention to incorporate the above teachings because the inventions are analogous art. One of ordinary skill in the arts at the time of invention would have been motivated for the reasons discussed by Vora (col 1, lines 15-20).

6. In regards to claim 4 and 8, Powers teaches of: Powers creating a pointer CoS scheme and a component...attribute-value pair ...(Fig 4). Powers does not explicitly teach the details of searching mechanism for his system nor does Powers teach of wherein the set of constraints, comprises CoS scope, wherein the COS scope is determined by a position of the COS definition entry in the directory server. In an analogous art, Vora explicitly teaches of searching mechanisms for his directory server (Col 12, lines 37-41, 60-65, Col 13, lines 63-67, Col 14, lines 15-25). Vora teaches that

Art Unit: 2142

queries can be made of the directory server (Col 1, lines 35-40), implicitly implying that querying functions allows user to more easily and efficiently locate a set of data entries. Vora teaches of the set of constraints, comprises CoS scope, wherein the COS scope is determined by a position of the COS definition entry in the directory server (fig 3a, col 9, lines 40-65). Refer to claim 1 for motivation.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2142

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M. Reid whose telephone number is 571 272 3903. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon- Fri (7-3:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

cmr:


BEATRIZ PRIETO
PRIMARY EXAMINER